
The Dynamics of International Politics. by Norman J. Padelford; George A. Lincoln; The United Nations and the Rule of Law: Charter Development through the Handling of International Disputes and Situations. by John W. Halderman

Review by: Saul H. Mendlovitz

Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aug., 1969), pp. 498-501

Published by: [Midwest Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2110239>

Accessed: 22/06/2014 19:48

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Midwest Political Science Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Midwest Journal of Political Science*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

covered, he will not find it. In a number of areas in which I am particularly interested, I found that the author's generalizations were too sweeping, too likely to ignore the inconvenient deviant case. But these problems are inherent in the genre of the interpretative essay. On balance, the subjects discussed are interesting and important to the political scientist and the observations offered stimulating and significant. Both the student and the mature scholar can benefit from becoming acquainted with them.

ROBERT E. SCOTT

The University of Illinois

The Dynamics of International Politics, 2nd ed., by Norman J. Padel-ford and George A. Lincoln. New York: The Macmillan Com-pany, 1967. Pp. 617. \$8.50.

The United Nations and the Rule of Law: Charter Development Through the Handling of International Disputes and Situations, by John W. Halderman. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Pub-lications, 1966. Pp. 248. \$7.50.

Those who found the first edition of *The Dynamics of International Politics* a helpful guide for understanding and manipulating the inter-national political system will undoubtedly receive this revised second edition quite enthusiastically. The authors of this well-known textbook have updated its content and have coupled a carefully thought-through refinement of their original frame of reference with rigorous stylistic editing. In the process they have added four new chapters and three appendices—including Charlton Ogburg, Jr.'s brilliantly written be-havioral description (Appendix A) of the manner in which an incident becomes a question posed for policy decision in the U. S. State Depart-ment. At the same time, the authors have reduced the actual text by fifty pages. The clarity of expression and straightforwardness of presentation make this indeed a very readable book.

The essential frame of reference, is that of the nation-state as actor, with national interest the guiding analytical and normative perspective. Furthermore, the approach is explicitly made narrower by analysing the international political system from the viewpoint of the U. S. policy plan:

"The approach to world politics through pragmatism and analysis of the underlying forces and interests is the approach attempted by the United States policy planner. It is a non-doctrinaire method starting from observation and analysis of basic factors in the world. This approach implicitly accepts certain values and objectives. At the same

time it recognizes that the values and objectives of other entities in the international scene may be different and may conflict. The chapters that follow are directed primarily to facts and analysis concerning matters of particular interest to the United States. Furthermore, because the principal struggle in the world is between the United States, on the one hand and Moscow and Peking on the other, the chapters give special emphasis to this problem and the dynamic forces contributing to it." (p. 49)

Despite the competence, scholarship, and responsible attitudes manifested in this book, I believe that the authors' frame of reference, just noted, suffers seriously from two major limitations. The first of these is ideological. In the concluding chapter, the authors write, "Time may be used to create a world in which even the Soviet, Chinese, and other authoritarian regimes will find that their most attractive alternative is to live on the same principles *we do*" (p. 509, my italics). Now no one need prefer the principles practiced in any authoritarian regime before he senses a lack of modesty in the authors' acceptance of the validity of the principles underlying United States behavior both in the world arena and at home. Given the revolutionary period in which we live, the "shrinking" world in which direct conflicts of ideologies, values, and interests are likely to become increasingly sharp, and given our own tradition of tolerance and ability to accommodate to new ideas and values, perspectives that accentuate our creativity and accommodative capacity seem to me much more appropriate.

Other readers may find the ideological commitment to United States foreign policy in Latin America—particularly in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic—and in Southeast Asia—particularly in Vietnam—somewhat disconcerting, even though the authors attempt to state the issues here in relatively neutral terms. The first ideological limitation of the book, then, is a too narrowly conceived view of United States' national interest. This same view, when held by policy makers, results in inappropriate and unwise policy formulation and implementation.

Perhaps even more important, however, than the book's ideological limitations is the authors' reliance upon traditional national interest theory as a way of viewing international political process.

Let me be quite clear. I would argue that over the past decade there has grown up a world order perspective on international relations. This enlarged perspective does not focus only upon the traditional international relations question of how policy makers maximize their goals. It also focuses on the extent to which political and social processes militate for or against the development of a war-prevention system and the creation of tolerable conditions of world wide economic welfare and human rights. Such a perspective, while recognizing the centrality of the nation-state in the contemporary international politi-

cal processes, looks to other existing and potential actors as means to achieving these values, not only through evolutionary growth but also through consciously planned drastic system change.

The methodology demanded by such a perspective consists of articulating preferred models of world order and depicting the way in which the present system might be transformed to bring about such a preferred world. In this perspective, national interest is not the final standard, again either empirically or normatively. Rather, the standard is some notion of world interest—a concept that a world order methodology must attempt to articulate, since it has not yet been clarified sufficiently for proper operational use.

The authors believe that “it is the responsibility of those with power to preserve the existent order until a better one can be devised irrespective of the popularity of their actions.” (p. 511) For that reason they urge the use of “practical realism” in carrying out U. S. foreign policy. They have provided us with a clear, concise statement of that particular view of international relations, and for that we should be thankful. Nevertheless, it is apparent that that view has become increasingly insufficient to comprehend present reality or to provide criteria for policy recommendations over the last third of the twentieth century. The problems of war prevention, economic welfare and human rights have become worldwide, and it is for scholars of the worldwide political process to develop a frame of reference with that perspective.

Many readers of John W. Halderman's *The United Nations and The Rule of Law* will undoubtedly question the viability of the rule of law as a method of achieving “a secure peace, based on justice.” (p. 3) Still others—this reviewer included—would have welcomed a much more substantial discussion of law, public opinion, and the establishment of a peaceful world community, beyond the author's statement that a potentially “effective” public opinion has been “confused” by positions and practices of member states and of the United Nations staff itself, and that this confusion tends to inhibit further development of a public opinion supporting the United Nations.

However, granting these matters as assumptions on which the author may properly avoid argument, it should also be said that Mr. Halderman has written an exceptionally workmanlike and in many ways penetrating constitutional-legal analysis of the United Nations. In his view, appropriate constitutional development is possible on a case-by-case basis, if member states make use of legal argumentation when the opportunity is available. He suggests a persuasive strategy of argument that would include the use of international and Charter law even when member states were demanding radical revision or abolition of that law. He minds us that the Charter did not establish a world authority, but instead provided only a very limited capacity for the organization

to make legally binding decisions for member states—the most significant instance, of course being Chapter VII, dealing with Security Council actions on Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression. Thus he is extremely critical of the attempt to establish the category of “peacekeeping” (not to be found in the Charter) as part of the collective enforcement-binding decision apparatus, and he feels strongly that it is necessary to distinguish sharply this latter apparatus from the peaceful-settlement-recommending structure of the United Nations.

In his final chapter, many of the issues previously discussed are related to that hardy but important perennial, law-politics dialectic. Here his statement of a constitutional framework for politics goes beyond a narrow and legalistic position.

Given the depth of his interest and his scholarship, one wishes that the author had written from a broader perspective—had perhaps questioned his assumptions and gone beyond them to ask what possibility there is for drastic change in the international system through legal techniques and other social and political processes. Perhaps he will do so in his next effort. Now he is to be commended for a contribution to the clarification of legal principles related to the thorny issues of the United Nations’ handling of international situations and disputes.

SAUL H. MENDLOVITZ

Rutgers—The State University

Simulation in the Study of Politics, edited by William D. Coplin.
Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1968. Pp. 365.

Simulation as an instructional and research technique has received increased academic attention in the past ten years. This book attempts to survey some of the model development and applications in the field of politics. The format of the book consists of a series of papers by scholars involved in simulation development explaining their models and possible usages, followed by comments by scholars in relevant substantive fields of politics who have not been actively involved with simulation techniques. The majority of the papers were presented at a symposium on Simulation Models of the Decision-Makers Environment held at Wayne State University in May, 1967. Among the discussants are Harold Guetzkow describing the Inter-Nation Simulation, a man-machine combination; Walter Clemens, the TEMPER computer model of international politics; John J. Crecine, a municipal budgeting computer model; Paul H. Ray and Richard D. Duke, urban “gaming” models combining man-computers; Charles G. Moore, heuristic pro-